U.S. Department of Education 2012 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School - 12CO3

School Type (Public Schools):		~		
(Check all that apply, if any)	Charter	Title 1	Magnet	Choice
Name of Principal: Mrs. Cher	yl Taylor			
Official School Name: Pear F	ark Elementary	School School		
School Mailing Address:	432 30 1/4 Roa	<u>ıd</u>		
	Grand Junction	n, CO 81504-	<u>-3153</u>	
County: Mesa	State School C	ode Number	*: <u>0363</u>	
Telephone: (970) 254-5960	E-mail: <u>Chery</u>	/l.Taylor@d:	51schools.org	
Fax: (970) 434-7415	Web site/URL:	http://www	w.mesa.k12.co.	<u>us</u>
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and				ity requirements on page 2 (Part II information is accurate.
]	Date
(Principal's Signature)				
Name of Superintendent*: Mr.	Steve Schultz	Superinten	dent e-mail: st	eve.schultz@d51schools.org
District Name: Mesa County V	Valley 51 Distr	rict Phone: (9	970) 254-5100	
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and				ity requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.
]	Date
(Superintendent's Signature)				
Name of School Board Preside	ent/Chairperson	: Mr. Harry	<u>Butler</u>	
I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and				ity requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.
]	Date
(School Board President's/Cha	irperson's Sign	nature)		

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

^{*}Non-Public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2011-2012 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2006.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 or 2011.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT

- 1. Number of schools in the district 27 Elementary schools (includes K-8) (per district designation): 9 Middle/Junior high schools

 5 High schools

 K-12 schools

 44 Total schools in district

 2. District per-pupil expenditure: 6396
- **SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)
- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

 Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 6
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2011 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	10	16	26		6	0	0	0
K	36	35	71		7	0	0	0
1	41	43	84		8	0	0	0
2	37	39	76		9	0	0	0
3	39	39	78		10	0	0	0
4	39	44	83		11	0	0	0
5	30	29	59		12	0	0	0
	Total in Applying School:						477	

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:	1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
	1 % Asian
	1 % Black or African American
	27 % Hispanic or Latino
	0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
	66 % White
	4 % Two or more races
	100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2010-2011 school year: 22% This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.	55
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.	49
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	104
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2010	477
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.22
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	22

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school:			
Total number of ELL students in the school:	20		
Number of non-English languages represented:	2		
Specify non-English languages:			

Spanish and Tagalog, Filipino

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:	72%
Total number of students who qualify:	348

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:	11%
Total number of students served:	52

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

2 Autism	Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	9 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	12 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	23 Speech or Language Impairment
1 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
4 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
1 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	Full-Time	Part-Time
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	15	1
Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.)	7	2
Paraprofessionals	4	1
Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)	7	3
Total number	34	7

12. Average school	l student-classroom teach	ner ratio, that is, t	the number of s	tudents in the school
divided by the	Full Time Equivalent of o	classroom teache	ers, e.g., 22:1:	

29:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	94%
High school graduation rate	%	%	%	%	%

14	For	schools	ending in	grade 1	2 (high	schools	١:
ıT.	TOI	SCHOOLS	chung m	graut i	. 2 (111211	SCHOOLS	,.

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2011 are doing as of Fall 2011.

Graduating class size:	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	%
Enrolled in a community college	 %
Enrolled in vocational training	 %
Found employment	 %
Military service	 %
Other	 %
Total	 0%

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools aw	ward
--	------

0	No
0	Vac

If yes, what was the year of the award?

Pear Park Elementary School opened in 2006 with 52% of our 345 students qualifying for free and reduced lunch. By 2011 we grew to 477 students with 77% qualifying for free and reduced lunch. As our population continues to increase, class sizes continue to increase, the free and reduced lunch percentage continues to increase, transient population continues to increase, but most importantly, our academic achievement scores continue to increase. The staff, parents, and students expect only the best out of Pear Park every single day, and that is exactly what is given. Last year, the school received 178 applications for students to attend Pear Park Elementary School on a School of Choice Transfer request. Our students feel so lucky to be Pear Park Pandas and our staff members feel fortunate to work at such a positive, collaborative school.

Our mission is to provide a safe learning community with high expectations; enabling students to become lifelong learners. This statement continues to develop and extend itself in new and creative expressions as we have seen our school grow and develop into a model Title I building within our local district and state.

Opening Pear Park was a challenge. We combined students from three Title I schools with vastly differing philosophies, curriculum, expectations and leadership styles. All three schools were poor performing and declining schools, according to the Colorado Department of Education. By year two, Pear Park was a very different school, with very high expectations for behavior and academics. Parents and students appreciated the clarity and consistency of our expectations, and our state scores began to reflect that what we were doing was best for kids.

One of the major contributors to Pear Park's success has been a strong commitment to Response to Intervention (RtI). RtI provides the venue for student-focused team collaboration, problem solving, and instructional planning and development. In spite of budget constraints, we have been able to use available resources and teachers' strengths to our advantage. Our intervention program and our daily schedule are at the heart and core of student successes. An "Intervention/Options Block Schedule" also allows for necessary uninterrupted core instruction time. A considerable amount of intense, yet creative scheduling contributed to a successful daily routine that works for staff and students alike. Ongoing, consistent communication between teachers, interventionists, and support personnel has provided the backdrop for successful blending of core curriculum with intervention programming and service delivery for students in all sectors of the RtI Pyramid.

Strong administrative support provides the needed leadership and foundation for positive involvement school wide. Staff and students are interacting with leadership on a continuous basis. An open door policy and a very-visible principal's presence provide an encouraging setting for positive communication.

Our staff development sessions provide targeted training for areas of need. We have presented book studies, videos, and personal trainings pertaining to principles developed by researchers and programs such as: Richard Allington, Fountas and Pinnell, Regie Routman, Daily 5, Reading Recovery, Six Traits of Writing, Orton-Gillingham Multisensory Approaches, and other local specialists. We aim to support teachers, whenever and wherever, answering their questions, "coming alongside" to assist and coach with ideas for supporting instructional approaches, data-use, and documentation.

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) is incorporated on a daily basis in all facets of school activities (lunchroom, playground, hallways, bus areas, sidewalks, and all types of classrooms). Our slogan, "Panda PALS are polite, responsible, safe, learners," is posted in every classroom. A school-wide, consistent rewards system is built into the fiber of our building. Students in every classroom earn the privilege of becoming a photographed "Panda PALS of the Week," and everyone has the opportunity to

earn "Panda PALS Notes" for positive performance behaviorally or academically. These notes can be traded for actual reward items at our Panda PALS store. Panda PALS recognition is noted throughout each day all around our campus.

Each grade level professional learning community (PLC) teaching team is asked to set goals for their students at the beginning of the year, and at the end of each quarter. Goal setting is inherent in the STAR progress monitoring programming and it is embedded into our RtI PLC conversations. In addition to the formal RtI meetings, the grade level PLC teams designate one planning period per week to problem-solve and discuss goals, strengths, weaknesses, and current needs of students within their particular grade level.

Our Student Council and National Elementary Honor Society members serve as role models within our school community. We are the only elementary school in Western Colorado to have a National Elementary Honor Society chapter and we focus on Scholarship, Responsibility, Leadership and Service. Recognitions and awards assemblies are part of each school year's highlights. We give recognition for attendance, behavior, academic achievement, academic growth, honesty and integrity. We are extremely proud of students and all of their academic and leadership successes.

1. Assessment Results:

A. The state standardized assessment categorizes achievement levels into four categories; Advanced, Proficient, Partially Proficient and Unsatisfactory. Advanced and Proficient are considered acceptable at the state level, Partially Proficient is acceptable at the national level but not at the state level, and Unsatisfactory is unacceptable at both levels. In 2011, Pear Park had 83% acceptable (14% higher than the state average) in reading for the state standard (Pear Park had 100% acceptable for national standard), 64% acceptable (9% higher than the state average) in writing for the state standard (Pear Park had 99.5% acceptable for the national standard), and 84% acceptable (16% higher than the state average) in math for the state standard (Pear Park had 98.5% acceptable for the national standard).

The Colorado Growth Model assesses each school's median growth percentile. The median growth percentile for the state is always 50. Pear Park's median growth percentile was 54 for reading, 54 for math and 56 for writing. The state also calculates the percent of students catching up for each subject. In reading, Pear Park had 83% catching up (47% higher than the state average). In Math, Pear Park had 58% catching up (33% higher than the state average). In writing, Pear Park had 66% catching up (24% higher than the state average. We are above the state in both academic achievement and average growth percentile. We have made adequate yearly progress for the last four years in all categories and subgroups.

B. We have had positive performance trends over the last five year period in all subjects and all subgroups. From 2007 until 2011, in reading we have increased by 34% proficient or advanced while the state increased by 1%. Minority students increased by 42%, English Language Learners (ELL) increased by 39%, free and reduced lunch students increased by 38% and our special education students increased by 19%. For the same years in math we increased by 32% proficient or advanced while the state increased by 1%. Minority students increased by 47%, ELL students increased by 57%, free and reduced lunch students increased by 35% and our special education students increased by 42%.

Our overall population and all of our subgroups have trended in a positive direction, significantly higher than the state's trends. The percentage of our students that are unsatisfactory has dropped significantly in all subjects as well. In reading we went from 20% of our students scoring unsatisfactory to 0% (NONE) of our students scoring unsatisfactory in 2011. In math we went from 14% of our students scoring unsatisfactory to 1% of our students scoring unsatisfactory in 2011. There is not an achievement gap of 10 or more percentage points in any of our subgroups compared to all students in any subject.

Our significant gains came from analyzing data and using an RtI approach to determine the needs of all of our students. Instructional flexibility and "change" is inherent in this process. We implemented a school wide RtI system in 2008 which allowed us to assess, monitor, discuss, and assist students individually. Universal/baseline screening data and benchmark guidelines help us as we place students into needed Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Adjustments are made within the framework of the contextual, daily use of our core curriculum.

Our RtI Grade Level PLC meetings allow for data review and instructional coaching, and our school-wide RtI team provides classroom data for our "Data Wall" and for our ongoing quarterly RtI Tracking spreadsheets. Progress monitoring (using Renaissance Learning's STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, and STAR Math) is implemented for every student in K-5. The progress monitoring assessments are given twice each month in reading and one time each month in math. As an RtI team, we review/discuss the data monthly, we make adjustments for students according to current performance, and we document all of this information in each student's "e-file." Parent involvement/input is an essential component of our RtI process and those contacts are also documented in the student's "e-file."

All additional support (interventions, ESL, special education) is aligned with core curriculum, so that "intervention students" receive repetition, practice, and support that aims at mastering the grade level standards. Our school day is organized in a fashion that promotes efficient utilization of teachers' and interventionists' time. A fixed, "Option Block" schedule (used school-wide) provides built-in provisions for protecting the participation in core curriculum throughout the day.

Another contributing factor continues to be the determination of each staff member's area of strength. Staff members' strengths are partnered with students' needs. As a team, we focus on being strong, enthusiastic role models with the goal of creating successful connections with students and intensifying "engagement" throughout the day. In summary, we believe that every child is every adult's responsibility, and that as a strong, committed team, we are each responsible for every child's success. We have changed our mindset to truly embrace "Every Child, Every Minute, Every Day; Rigorous Learning."

2. Using Assessment Results:

We use assessment data from various sources. We currently use common curriculum-based weekly assessments in reading and math at each grade level. We use Renaissance Learning STAR assessments twice a month in reading and once each month in math. We use the DRA2 quarterly, and we use CSAP yearly along with informal data such as running records, district created continuums and teacher observations. We have a data wall (fashioned after Linda Dorn's Comprehensive Intervention Model) which includes every student in every grade.

Proficiency levels are broken into four tiers and three levels within each tier. Data continuously supports decisions for interventions students receive, and identifies their subgroup. We update this data wall every quarter. Every child is placed in a level within a tier based on several pieces of data. Tiers are further defined by each grade level's team-created "cut scores" for each assessment being used. We align the cut scores across all grade levels, so that we can ensure that our resources are being used at the grades with the highest needs. We use the national RtI tier levels. In addition, we've added three levels within each tier: High Risk, Medium Risk, and Low Risk. We also added an Enrichment tier. These ten levels really allow us to see exactly where a child is and what resources we have to help each child.

At the end of each year, we finalize each child's RtI file and update their RtI tier and level. When we return in the fall, we assess all students that ended the previous year below grade level to identify current gains or losses. Within the first week of school, we place students in option block groups (interventions, ELL, special education), and those groups begin meeting on the fourth day of school. Starting week one, students receive the support they need so that no time is lost.

During the first three days of school, our support staff members give our new students baseline formal and informal assessments and universal screenings to determine which of our new students need to be put into an option block support group. As we enroll new students, we immediately give them the STAR assessment in math and reading to clarify their current performance level(s). STAR data (initial screening and ongoing monitoring) provides individual diagnostic information which includes suggestions for "next steps" instructionally. This immediate data allows us to avoid missing any students that needs extra support. Subsequently we have important data that can inform teachers and positively affect instructional approaches immediately. Parents are informed of instructional decisions at all levels of the continuum from special education to enrichment.

We use the CSAP data to inform us of curriculum gaps and of the strengths and weaknesses of each teacher, student, class, and grade level. After analyzing trends in the data over time we are able to make changes within our curriculum and teaching strategies. We examine each standard and benchmark to identify specific strengths and weaknesses among students, teachers and curriculum. We analyze this data before school starts, and review it throughout the year. Ongoing assessments through the year allow us to determine if our students are making the progress necessary to reach grade level proficiency on the standards.

Every student has a reading and math goal for STAR assessments. At the end of each assessment, the student is given their score and they see their trend line and growth line. Teachers discuss with each student what they have done to attain growth and what they will do to continue improving (no matter what their current level is). Students become competitive with each other (all scores are private and confidential but students often tell each other how much they grew) and with themselves as they strive toward continuous improvement. Parents also receive a copy of the graphs with their student's scores in math and reading. When we have a concern about a child's lack of growth, we call the parent and invite them in to have a conversation with our team. We share the data and set a plan that the parent, the school, and the student can participate in to help the student progress. This process is constantly in motion and continues throughout the year for each child.

We share individual data with each student and their parents/guardians. We share class, grade level and school-wide data with parents, students and the community. We are very proud of our data and we believe it shows us what we are doing well and where we can improve. We value input from any stakeholder. We are continually looking at various pieces of both formal and informal data and making necessary changes. We ensure that ongoing communication exists with our staff, parents and students, so that no child is left behind.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Over the last four years, we have become collaborative with other schools within our school district, as well as schools from other districts within the state. As a Title I school that consistently achieves above average results for the state, we have become a resource for other schools, administrators, and teachers. Over the last 3 years, we have had between nine and fourteen schools visit us each year to observe and have conversations with our staff about Pear Park's curriculum, structures, philosophy, expectations, PBIS program, Daily 5 routines, and RtI processes. We have had schools from our school district and from the surrounding cities of Delta, Montrose, Meeker, Rifle and DeBeque come to visit us, as well as visitors from the Colorado Department of Education.

We strongly believe in what we do here and enthusiastically share our ideas with other educators. Prior to a visit from another school, our principal contacts the visiting group to find out what their purpose of the visit is and what they want to accomplish so we can ensure that we meet their needs. When they arrive, we have our staff meet with them from 8:00-8:45 to share information and answer specific questions. At 8:45 our students arrive and the visitors observe classrooms and intervention groups. Our students and teachers are very comfortable with visitors in their classrooms. We encourage all visitors to ask students or staff members any questions they have. After observing in the classrooms, we have the group get back together to answer any additional questions and share what they saw. Then they go back out to observe anything they still want to see. At the end of their visit, we meet once more and exchange contact information so that we can continue to support each other.

We have also presented at district, regional and state level meetings on our RtI structures. We meet quarterly as a district on RtI and each quarter we do a presentation to the group about the process we follow for RtI. We participate in the National RtI network, and one of our teachers even wrote a piece for their newsletter. We share our schedule and options block format with other schools. We love to share what we have with anybody who is interested, as well as learn from anyone we can.

4. Engaging Families and Communities:

We believe it is beneficial to our students if we have a strong relationship with parents and community. Every year we partner with a local business that supports our students' learning. We show our appreciation to them through writing letters, thanking them in our newsletter and marque and inviting them to our family events.

After our second year as an RtI school, we made parent involvement and communication a priority. We made a commitment as an RtI team to meet with every parent of every student we place on RtI. We ask

the parent to sign a "Form J" so that we can communicate with any outside agencies working with the child. It allows us to do additional testing to help determine why the child is struggling.

We have thirty-two hours a year of parent teacher conferences. We modify our meeting times from the districts to accommodate our families' work schedules. We move our May conferences to February so that we can have another formal opportunity to support our parents to support our students while there is still time left in the school year for students to grow.

We have two "Food For Thought Nights" a year during which we provide free dinner for everyone who comes. These include math and reading activities with the children as well as ideas for parents to support their children in math and reading. Our Parent Teacher Organization holds four free evening family events in which all can participate. We have a yearly 5K run/walk that encourages all of our students and their families to get out and get healthy. We have a monthly School Accountability Committee meeting where parents and community members can review school data, participate in our Unified Improvement Plan development and have a voice in any decisions for our school. Our yearly "Celebrations of Generations" brings grandparents in to celebrate the differences between generations with our students.

Fifty-two of our fourth and fifth grade students serve on Student Council and National Elementary Honor Society. They venture into the community and participate in community service projects quarterly. These students also volunteer at Special Olympics. We have found that having our students give back to the community creates appreciation for what they have in their lives, and they continually strive to always be a better student and person. It opens their eyes to what it takes to be successful in life and it helps them to feel part of a bigger picture. Our students are very proud to attend Pear Park, and this pride instills a responsibility to be the very best student and person they can be.

1. Curriculum:

Pear Park Elementary has a core curriculum that addresses the Colorado State Standards in each content area. There are grade level expectations found in each standard. We have selected curriculum that meets the majority of the standards and grade level expectations. If weaknesses are present in the core curriculum then they are addressed by creating "gap lessons" to ensure all grade level expectations are taught and met with student mastery.

Mesa County District 51 Schools' Physical Education Committee, which included Pear Park's physical education teacher, aligned the lessons and activities with the Comprehensive Health and Physical Education Colorado State Standards. The lessons covered motor skills, movement patterns, healthy eating and lifelong habits for a fit and healthy life. A variety of games, activities, role play and whole body movements are taught to foster mental, emotional and social health skills as well as substance abuse prevention. Our physical education teacher organized "The Panda Waddle Race," which is a fun 5K event. The runners included students, parents, teachers and runners from the community. Nutrition is addressed through the Integrated Nutrition Education Program. Students participate in the preparation of the food, and the lessons include nutritional facts in kid friendly language. Our health-conscience staff stresses the importance of exercise and good nutrition. "Girls on the Run" is an after-school program that promotes the importance of health, exercise and good self-image for our female students.

The music curriculum covers expression and creation of music along with theory and evaluation of music. The students learn to compose and evaluate music through a variety of conventions, mechanics and structures of sound. Performances throughout the year are culminating activities which utilize the skills taught in classes. Students perform at senior care facilities several times throughout the school year. They also participate in the Parade of Lights in our city during the holiday season. A talent show is held at year end for students, staff and parents.

Visual arts are taught by the classroom teachers and guest presenters. The second grade classes participate in the Art Heritage program offered by the school district. Next year the program will be offered to other grade levels.

In Reading, the McMillian/McGraw-Hill Treasures Reading Series is utilized for reading mastery using units that spiral and align within each grade from kindergarten through fifth grade. Within the units, scope and sequence are guided by standards.

The Investigations in Number, Data and Space series is utilized in mathematics. It uses exploratory methods and problem solving skills from kindergarten through fifth grade. It is designed to help children understand fundamental ideas of number operations, geometry, measurement and beginning algebra. Math and reading curriculum will be covered in more detail in future questions.

In science and social studies, we have created pacing guides and study units to teach the standards. Each grade is responsible for parts within each standard with varying emphasis. For example, fifth grade is predominantly responsible for Earth Systems in science and fourth grade is responsible for Life Science. We have created a variety of lessons to cover and support the required standards in science and social studies at each grade level. Leveled books matching each grade level's standards were purchased, allowing all levels of readers to learn about the same social studies and science concepts.

Classroom teachers are required to teach the technology standards within the classroom. We use a wide variety of programs to teach and support the standards including Kidspiration, CyberSmart, Kidpix,

PowerPoint, Google Earth, Word, Publisher, Storybird and e-mail. All of these programs are then expanded in the computer lab as a special area of instruction.

2. Reading/English:

Pear Park Elementary chose McMillan McGraw Hill <u>Treasures</u> Reading Series for K-5, because it is a comprehensive, scientifically research based reading program that offers a wealth of high quality literature to engage learners. Explicit instruction and ample practice ensure students' growth. It contains the five components necessary for a balanced literacy program: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. The series connects the phonics rules for the week in spelling with the reading curriculum, reinforcing the skills. The vocabulary includes words for the general classroom plus words above and beyond for the advanced learner. Each week has a different type of graphic organizer to go along with the comprehension strategy and skill being studied for the week. It has resources for improving fluency for whole class or small groups. Using the <u>Daily 5</u> (<u>Gail Boushey</u> and Joan Mose) structure also insures that our students get the necessary time with at-level books each and every day along with word work that parallels the spelling and vocabulary instruction. Every classroom incorporates the <u>Daily 5</u> components into their classroom every day. These include: Read to Self; Read to Someone; Listen to Reading; Work on Writing; Word Work.

We use systematic, explicit instruction in all five components. The components of phonics and phonemic awareness are key in the development of foundational reading skills. We provide direct teaching of decoding, comprehension and literature appreciation. We have a relentless review of progress or lack of progress and flexibly move students in or out of identified intervention groups. In addition, we use multisensory approaches during the intervention process. Using the <u>Treasure's</u> leveled readers for small groups during reading intervention sessions allows for an integration of classroom core curriculum within the framework of intervention sessions and gives the students a double or triple dose of the strategies and skills being taught. It also presents multiple exposures to the weekly vocabulary words. We teach students to express with written language their comprehension from text, both in the regular classroom and in reading intervention groups. In general education classrooms and intervention support groups, we utilize best practices from Richard Allington's 6 T's in selecting what we spend our time doing, what we teach, how and what we talk about, the tasks we have the students do, the text selections and what we test. Many ideas from Regie Routman's <u>Reading Essentials</u>, <u>Writing Essentials</u>, and <u>Teaching Essentials</u> have also been presented to staff and incorporated in instructional methodologies.

3. Mathematics:

In math we use <u>Investigations in Number, Data and Space</u>. <u>Investigations</u> is a K-5 mathematics curriculum, developed at TERC in Cambridge, Massachusetts. It is designed to help all children understand fundamental ideas of number and operations, geometry, data, measurement and early algebra. We have also done an analysis of the standards that are covered through Investigations and the depth that they are covered. There were several holes in the program so we have created gap lessons in mathematics at all grades. We pulled from various resources to fill these holes.

In both reading and math we have a pacing guide created by the district that ensures all material is taught in a timely manner. This helps us to move at a pace that ensures all standards will be introduced and practiced. This includes time built in to go back and review or reteach. We use weekly assessments and benchmark assessments to analyze what the students have learned and what areas we need to go back and reteach to certain students.

We use a Workshop model guided by the 6T's of our Mathematical Frameworks (mirroring our literacy practices which were based on Allington's 6 T's). The 6 T's in mathematics are: Time, Tools, Teach, Tools, Talk and Tasks. Our instruction takes each math concept from concrete to representational to abstract so that all students have entry points to grade level content. Every classroom creates anchor charts containing explanations and representations of mathematical thinking. Mathematical tools are easily accessible for use by the teacher and students.

Students are familiar with expectations; they move efficiently between activities and support each other in risk-taking and sharing. Throughout the math block, there are a variety of groupings: whole group, small group, pairs, and individual. Learning tasks align with the posted learning targets. The teacher facilitates the development of important mathematical ideas through discussions and asks probing/clarifying/redirecting questions that focus and extend students' mathematical thinking. Students are engaged and actively involved in their own learning. They demonstrate their learning by describing, explaining, and justifying their mathematical thinking.

We progress monitor students through weekly assessments and teachers record observations. We provide small group Math Club time before school for approximately 6-8 students per teacher three days per week. In those math clubs, students have the opportunity to participate in Do The Math, Add+Vantage Math Recovery, or small group Investigations guided practice. During the school day, students practice their computation skills using Fastt Math, a computer based math facts program.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Pear Park's mission is to provide a safe learning community with high expectations; enabling students to become lifelong learners. Our physical education/health/nutrition program focuses on helping our students achieve this goal. A safe learning community and lifelong learners are created in physical education through cooperative/teamwork activities, health lessons about how the body works, critical thinking activities and practices that will keep them active for a lifetime. In physical education class, playground rules are taught and practiced as well as our PBIS expectations (PALS-Polite, Are Responsible, Learners, Safe).

We begin the year in physical education reviewing/introducing all of the various locations of our school, discussing what PALS behavior looks like at each location, modeling and then practicing the appropriate behavior. We do this for all of our indoor areas (library, cafeteria, restroom, hallway, etc.) as well as for all of our outside areas and games (playground equipment, four square, tetherball, freeze tag, etc.). In physical education they discuss and practice safety to and from school if they ride a bike, walk, or take the bus. They learn how to keep themselves and their friends' safe on the way to school, while at school, and on the way home from school. Through many of these lessons the students practice being respectful to others, taking responsibility for one's actions, problem solving, and compromising. Throughout the year, these skills are reviewed and practiced so that students continue to grow into lifelong learners.

In our physical education class, students keep writing journals where they log their daily activity, their nutritional intake, and their mental state. They journal their feelings as they try new skills in physical education, music, math, literacy, science, and social studies. Students enjoy journaling; they go back and read what they have written previously, and they are proud of themselves for how much they have grown as writers and how much they have grown in various skills.

We provide nutrition lessons through physical education that are age appropriate. Students learn how to balance the food groups, how food fuels their body and brain, and how unhealthy choices affect their lifelong health. They assess and take responsibility for personal behaviors and learn techniques to manage their own stress levels. Students participate cooperatively and productively in group and team activities. Through various lessons and activities that support academics, healthy lifelong activities and appropriate nutrition, our physical education department helps create a safe learning community with high expectations; enabling students to become lifelong learners.

5. Instructional Methods:

Assessments have been an important piece of information in determining what our students need so that we can effectively differentiate instruction. These include Renaissance Learning STAR assessments, CSAP, Marie Clay's Observation Survey, and curriculum based assessments. In 2008 we changed our school-wide schedule to ensure that none of our students missed core instruction. We provide differentiated instruction through the general education teacher, through support staff in the general

education classroom, or through support staff outside of the general education classroom-depending on what each child needs. Our support staff includes staff certified in special education, ELL, gifted and talented, and reading.

We use grade level materials along with "targeted, intensive intervention approaches" (as needed) with students, and we provide the appropriate amount of scaffolding and teacher support for each student to be successful and grow. We believe students need to be exposed to grade level material and with the support of a teacher, the student can work toward proficiency in each standard at each grade level. With a few of our students we provide Wilson© or Fundations© when the data shows us that it would be an effective intervention for reading. We "triple dip" the students that need Wilson© or Fundations© so that we can ensure they are receiving the necessary instruction they need to grow, while also exposing them to grade level material.

We use materials from our core curriculum to support some of our diverse learners. In our <u>Treasures</u> reading series, we use the Treasure Chest materials for our ELL students, the Triumphs materials for our special education students and the "beyond" materials for our advanced students. These materials use the same strategies, skills, and vocabulary words that are in the core curriculum with appropriate accommodations, modifications or accelerations necessary.

We bring students in before the school day starts to provide Math Clubs with small groups of students working with a teacher on a specific skill. We analyze our data regularly through our RtI process and we make needed adjustments to support all students.

We use technology to support all of our learners through a variety of programs. Some of the most utilized programs are My Reading Coach, Lexia, Read Naturally, RAZ kids, FASTT Math, Cool Math Games and IXL Math. Our reading series provides all of the leveled readers and the anthology stories online for students to listen to at school or at home.

Differentiated instruction and intervention approaches at Pear Park are built on an intense focus of early identification along with prompt and intense interventions. Urgency and acceleration are at the heart of all of Pear Park's differentiated instruction.

6. Professional Development:

Since Pear Park opened its doors in August of 2006, formal professional development activities have been integrated into the monthly planning calendars. Two Wednesday afternoons per month have been reserved for professional development activities. Over the past six years, the Pear Park team has been trained by a variety of experts from outside our district as well as staff members from within our building and district. During the first three years, our emphasis was primarily in the area of literacy, and we broadened our expertise through exposure to the following training: Treasures reading curriculum experts, Treasures training videos, The Daily 5 book study, The Daily 5 training videos, Six Traits@ trainers, Orton Gillingham@ teachers, Reading Recovery@ trainers and teachers, Regional Regional Regional

Mini-training sessions in the areas of literacy and mathematics have also been conducted by building staff members. Literacy, math, and writing conferences within district and outside of district provided valuable information which is shared with PLCs and the entire staff (wherever needed/appropriate). When a staff member attends a conference, the expectation is that they come back and share the learned information with all staff members and their room becomes a visitation room. A variety of webinars have been shared pertaining to the area of literacy, math, and positive behavioral support. (PBIS).

Although it appears there have been numerous areas of staff development, they all tie together. We focused on reading for the first three years and our Instructional Leadership Team made sure that all staff development sessions continued to build on the previous one. Ongoing observations and discussion took place so that improvement in instructional practices was implemented.

Our professional development is also woven into the fiber of our school culture. Staff development occurs in many informal ways: chats in the hallway, offers to visit other staff members' classrooms, demonstration lessons, RtI discussions that turn into professional developments, e-tips sent out intermittently by principal or specialists, books that are shared through our Professional Development Library, book talks that occur between teachers, and webinars that are made available to the entire staff.

Our student achievement continues to improve as we continue to grow as educators. We are constantly learning so that our students can continuously improve.

7. School Leadership:

All of Pear Park's successes relate directly back to our leadership's commitment to our mission which is to provide a safe learning community with high expectations; enabling students to become lifelong learners. The principal works closely not only with the staff and students, but is highly involved with the parents. She has an open door policy for staff, students and parents. Often times she will make home visits to make sure situations are handled and resolved for the benefit of the students and families. Her leadership has created a school culture that she makes no exception about- the expectation that every student is the responsibility of every teacher. The school climate offers an administration, staff, community and student body that work toward goals with high expectations. It is our principal's firm belief all children can learn and be prepared for successful, productive, happy futures. Her primary focus, along with the staff, is to meet the needs of every student which entails every minute of every day being dedicated to meaningful learning.

Every person involved in Pear Park must take responsibility for student's learning and become a leader. Each student is involved in setting personal and academic goals with direction from the teachers. Parents may participate in our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), which helps organize evening school-wide events, or they may participate in our School Accountability Committee, where they help analyze data and make organizational, academic and financial decisions.

Staff members take on many leadership roles through various committees and responsibilities. Staff may participate on the Building Leadership Team, which focuses on safety, structural and organizational issues. They may participate on the Instructional Leadership Team which focuses on analyzing data and determining our staff development needs. Some staff members participate in our PTO. All staff members participate on our RtI team, which focuses on specific needs of students to ensure no student is left behind.

All decisions made by Pear Park's leadership teams have led to improving student achievement. The principal is responsible for deciding how to best utilize our Title I money. She carefully analyzes what would best lead to student achievement, involving staff and parents in her choices. A major decision of hers was to opt out of hiring a vice principal; she chose instead to use those funds to procure two extra intervention teachers. This obviously led to more students receiving needed interventions and greater student achievement. The bottom line is that the students are the most important individuals and all decisions are made based on what is best for them to succeed.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	82	82	92	74	64
Advanced	43	38	48	29	26
Number of students tested	72	65	75	58	61
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	1	1	1	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Proficient and Advanced	77	79	89	73	59
Advanced	33	32	49	27	21
Number of students tested	48	53	45	30	34
2. African American Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students			<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	<u> </u>
Proficient and Advanced	79	67	87	83	36
Advanced	29	22	47	25	14
Number of students tested	28	18	15	12	14
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	6	4	5	8	9
5. English Language Learner Students				·	
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	8	7	6	2	5
6. Homeless Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested		4			

NOTES:

Our state allows parents to opt out their students from the state assessment if they choose. The student counts as a non proficient score toward our percent of students proficient or advanced, so it counts against our scores. In 2007 we had one opt out and in 2011 we had one opt out. The number of students alternatively assessed comes from a district program that is housed in our building. Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

SCHOOL SCORES Proficient and Advanced 79 90 91 65 52		2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Proficient and Advanced 79 90 91 65 52 Advanced 8 2 6 2 5 Number of students tested 72 63 77 57 61 Percent of total students tested 99 100 100 98 100 Number of students alternatively assessed 4 1 1 1 1 1 2 Percent of students alternatively assessed 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 SUBGROUP SCORES I. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students Proficient and Advanced 75 88 87 55 44 Advanced 6 0 4 0 0 0 Number of students steted 48 51 47 29 34 Z. African American Students Proficient and Advanced 8 1 1 1 1 3. Hispanic or Latino Students Proficient and Advanced 8 8 80 80 50 36 Advanced 9 0 7 0 7 0 0 0 Number of students tested 8 80 80 50 36 Advanced 9 1 0 7 0 0 0 Number of students tested 9 5 5 8 9 S. English Language Learner Students Proficient and Advanced 8 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 9 9 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 Proficient and Advanced 9 9 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 Proficient and Advanced 9 9 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 Proficient and Advanced 9 9 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 Proficient and Advanced 9 9 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	Testing Month	Feb	Feb	Feb	Feb	Feb
Advanced 8	SCHOOL SCORES					
Number of students tested 72	Proficient and Advanced	79	90	91	65	52
Percent of total students tested 99	Advanced	8	2	6	2	5
Number of students alternatively assessed 4 1 1 1 2 Percent of students alternatively assessed 100 100 100 100 100 SUBGROUP SCORES 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students Proficient and Advanced 6 0 4 0 0 Number of students tested 48 51 47 29 34 2. African American Students 8 1 4 29 34 Advanced 6 0 4 0 0 Number of students tested 1 1 1 1 Advanced 68 80 80 50 36 Advanced 7 0 7 0 0 Advanced 7 0 7 0 0 Number of students tested 6 5 5 8 9 5. English Language Learner Students 8 4 6 2	Number of students tested	72	63	77	57	61
Percent of students alternatively assessed 100 1	Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	98	100
Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 Advanced 68 80 80 50 36 Advanced 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 Advanced 70 70 70 70 70 Advanced 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 Advanced 70 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 70 Number of students tested 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 7	Number of students alternatively assessed	4	1	1	1	2
Number of students tested 7	Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
Proficient and Advanced 75 88 87 55 44 Advanced 6 0 4 0 0 Number of students tested 48 51 47 29 34 2. African American Students *** Proficient and Advanced	SUBGROUP SCORES					
Advanced 6 0 4 0 0 Number of students tested 48 51 47 29 34 2. African American Students Proficient and Advanced	1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged S	tudents			
Number of students tested	Proficient and Advanced	75	88	87	55	44
2. African American Students	Advanced	6	0	4	0	0
Proficient and Advanced	Number of students tested	48	51	47	29	34
Number of students tested 1	2. African American Students					
Number of students tested 1 1 3. Hispanic or Latino Students Proficient and Advanced 68 80 80 50 36 Advanced 7 0 7 0 0 Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 4. Special Education Students Proficient and Advanced Advanced 8 9 5 8 9 5. English Language Learner Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced 8 4 6 2 5	Proficient and Advanced					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students Forficient and Advanced 68 80 80 50 36	Advanced					
Proficient and Advanced 68 80 80 50 36 Advanced 7 0 7 0 0 Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 4. Special Education Students Proficient and Advanced Advanced 0	Number of students tested			1	1	
Advanced 7 0 7 0 0 Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 4. Special Education Students Proficient and Advanced Advanced 0 <td< td=""><td>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Number of students tested 28 15 15 12 14 4. Special Education Students Proficient and Advanced Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced	68	80	80	50	36
4. Special Education Students Proficient and Advanced	Advanced	7	0	7	0	0
Proficient and Advanced	Number of students tested	28	15	15	12	14
Advanced 6 5 5 8 9 5. English Language Learner Students Proficient and Advanced <	4. Special Education Students					
Number of students tested 6 5 5 8 9 5. English Language Learner Students Proficient and Advanced <td>Proficient and Advanced</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Proficient and Advanced					
5. English Language Learner Students Proficient and Advanced	Advanced					
Proficient and Advanced <t< td=""><td>Number of students tested</td><td>6</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></t<>	Number of students tested	6	5	5	8	9
Advanced 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced Advanced Image: Colspan="2">Image:	5. English Language Learner Students					<u> </u>
Number of students tested 8 4 6 2 5 6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced	Proficient and Advanced					
6. Homeless Students Proficient and Advanced Advanced	Advanced					
Proficient and Advanced	Number of students tested	8	4	6	2	5
Advanced	6. Homeless Students					
	Proficient and Advanced					
Number of students tested 5 3 4	Advanced					
	Number of students tested	5	3	4		

NOTES:

Our state allows parents to opt out their students from the state assessment if they choose. The student counts as a non-proficient score toward our percent of students proficient or advanced, so it counts against our scores. In 2007 we had one opt out and in 2011 we had one opt out. The number of students alternatively assessed comes from a district program that is housed in our building. Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	76	77	64	60	54
Advanced	29	30	16	22	16
Number of students tested	59	73	61	58	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	1	3	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES			<u> </u>		<u> </u>
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic I	Disadvantaged S	tudents			
Proficient and Advanced	71	74	51	54	45
Advanced	37	25	9	14	11
Number of students tested	41	53	35	37	38
2. African American Students				·	
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested		2			1
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and Advanced	71	81	64	33	35
Advanced	29	25	14	8	10
Number of students tested	14	16	14	12	20
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	4	7	7	8	7
5. English Language Learner Students				·	
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	6	1	3	8
6. Homeless Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	2	1		

NOTES:

The number of students alternatively assessed comes from a district program that is housed in our building. Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	81	71	61	67	38
Advanced	3	3	2	3	2
Number of students tested	58	73	62	58	55
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	1	3	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES				<u> </u>	
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	c Disadvantaged St	tudents			
Proficient and Advanced	83	70	44	64	37
Advanced	0	4	0	0	3
Number of students tested	41	53	36	36	38
2. African American Students					<u> </u>
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested		2			1
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and Advanced	79	44	36	58	25
Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	14	16	14	12	20
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	4	7	7	8	7
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	6	1	3	8
6. Homeless Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	2	1		

NOTES:

Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

12CO3

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	91	64	61	45	36
Advanced	42	20	26	7	7
Number of students tested	74	64	62	56	55
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	2	2	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	
SUBGROUP SCORES			<u> </u>		<u> </u>
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic I	Disadvantaged S	tudents			
Proficient and Advanced	89	58	52	41	28
Advanced	37	17	21	3	10
Number of students tested	57	48	42	34	29
2. African American Students				·	
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	1			2	2
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and Advanced	90	57	36	31	31
Advanced	43	14	7	0	0
Number of students tested	21	14	14	16	13
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced		30			
Advanced		0			
Number of students tested	4	10	8	5	7
5. English Language Learner Students				·	
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	6	1	4	4	4
6. Homeless Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	1	4		

NOTES:

Our state allows parents to opt out their students from the state assessment if they choose. The student counts as a non-proficient score toward our percent of students proficient or advanced, so it counts against our scores. In 2007 we had one opt out and in 2011 we had one opt out. The number of students alternatively assessed comes from a district program that is housed in our building. Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Colorado State Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year: 1997 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	88	65	61	64	56
Advanced	4	6	5	4	2
Number of students tested	74	65	61	56	55
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	1	2	2	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	
SUBGROUP SCORES				<u> </u>	<u> </u>
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic	Disadvantaged S	tudents			
Proficient and Advanced	88	63	56	59	52
Advanced	5	4	2	3	3
Number of students tested	57	48	41	34	29
2. African American Students					<u> </u>
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	1			2	2
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and Advanced	86	43	50	25	46
Advanced	5	7	0	0	0
Number of students tested	21	14	14	16	13
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced		40			
Advanced		0			
Number of students tested	4	10	8	5	7
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	6	1	4	4	4
6. Homeless Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	1	4		

NOTES:

Our state allows parents to opt out their students from the state assessment if they choose. The student counts as a non-proficient score toward our percent of students proficient or advanced, so it counts against our scores. In 2007 we had one opt out and in 2011 we had one opt out. The number of students alternatively assessed comes from a district program that is housed in our building. Students with Severe Special Needs for the district come to our school and they are given a state alternative test, but they do not count in our student population because they are from all over the district, not from our attendance area.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: Weighted Average

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient and Advanced	83	74	73	59	51
Advanced	38	29	31	19	16
Number of students tested	205	202	198	172	172
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	3	4	6	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES					'
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ	omic Disadv	antaged Stu	dents		
Proficient and Advanced	80	70	65	55	44
Advanced	35	24	27	14	14
Number of students tested	146	154	122	101	101
2. African American Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	1	2	0	3	3
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					'
Proficient and Advanced	80	68	62	47	34
Advanced	33	20	23	9	8
Number of students tested	63	48	43	40	47
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced	64	47	40	14	21
Advanced	7	4	20	0	4
Number of students tested	14	21	20	21	23
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and Advanced	70	57	72		11
Advanced	12	7	9		0
Number of students tested	17	14	11	9	17
6.					
Proficient and Advanced	80				
Advanced	30				
	10	7	9	0	0

12CO3

Subject: Reading Grade: Weighted Average

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month					
SCHOOL SCORES			<u>-</u>		<u>-</u>
Proficient and Advanced	82	75	72	65	48
Advanced	5	3	4	2	3
Number of students tested	204	201	200	171	171
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	6	3	4	6	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	100	100	100	100	100
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ	omic Disadv	antaged Stu	dents		
Proficient and Advanced	82	73	64	59	43
Advanced	3	2	2	1	1
Number of students tested	146	152	124	99	101
2. African American Students					
Proficient and Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested	1	2	1	3	3
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient and Advanced	76	55	55	42	34
Advanced	4	2	2	0	0
Number of students tested	63	45	43	40	47
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient and Advanced	35	50	29	14	17
Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	14	22	20	21	23
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient and Advanced	59	27	45		23
Advanced	6	0	0		0
Number of students tested	17	11	11	9	17
6.					
Proficient and Advanced	80				
Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	10	6	9	0	0
NOTES:					

12CO3